

time around despite your concerns that it didn't. In my view, it did work and we ought not to change the policy at this point, having just seen it go into effect a couple of years ago. So I oppose the Kristensen amendment.

SENATOR CROSBY: Thank you, Senator Wesely. Senator Withem, on the Kristensen amendment.

SPEAKER WITHEM: Yes, Madam President, and members of the body, I would oppose the Kristensen amendment. Senator Kristensen, you know, talks about the Nebraska Unicameral Legislature and then kind of dismisses that. I guess that's a good debate technique to take what might be a strong argument against your position, raise it yourself and then dismiss it offhandedly. But I think what...by dismissing the fact that Nebraska has a Unicameral Legislature system and no one else does really trivializes the...the ability of Nebraska, even as a very conservative, bedrock conservative state, in many ways, we have not been reluctant to look at our governmental processes and try some experimentation, many experiments that have worked, the Unicameral Legislature being one of those; nonpartisanship, not just in the Legislature but in many other offices in the state. Our Natural Resources District, I think we led the state in those. Public power, the list is pretty long when you look at the symbol of Nebraska as a very conservative state but look at some of the things we've been willing to take on as ways in which we might be able to make our governmental processes work better. And I think the electoral college is one of those. And the fact that only one other state has chosen to do this, I don't think is a reason to...to move backward. It's kind of an interesting argument here when the bill was before us, when Senator Schimek's bill was before us, all of this hand wringing and consternation was what will happen, how embarrassed Nebraska will be when our electoral votes are split and people look at Nebraska and look at that and we'll be the laughing stock of the nation, so we shouldn't do it. We do it. Our electoral votes weren't split so now people are coming back and saying, well, we tried this and it didn't work, didn't split our vote, so there's absolutely no reason for leaving this in place. I think the fact that philosophically moving from winner take all in the state down to congressional district forwarding of electoral votes takes those electoral votes closer to the people. We have not had a presidential election, in my memory of reading history, I don't think we've had a presidential election since 19...1876 in which the candidate was ultimately elected